

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 404

CS 212 693

AUTHOR Chao, Han-Hua, Comp.
TITLE Peer Response in Learning to Write. Learning Package No. 38.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 47p.; For other learning packages in this series, see CS 212 656-705. Some material in the packet may not be completely legible when reproduced; copies provided are the best available.
AVAILABLE FROM Learning Packages, ERIC/RCS, Indiana University, Smith Research Center, Suite 150, 2805 E. 10th St., Bloomington, IN 47408-2698 (\$14.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Classroom Techniques; *Cooperative Learning; Distance Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Group Discussion; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Peer Groups; *Peer Teaching; Research Papers (Students); Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Writing; Speaking Writing Relationship

ABSTRACT

Originally developed as part of a project for the Department of Defense Schools (DoDDS) system, this learning package on peer response in learning to write is designed for teachers who wish to upgrade or expand their teaching skills on their own. The package includes an overview of the project; a comprehensive search of the ERIC database; a lecture giving an overview on the topic; copies of existing ERIC/RCS publications on the topic; a set of guidelines for completing a goal statement, a reaction paper, and an application project; and an evaluation form. (SR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ERIC/RCS

150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Learning Package #38

**Peer Response in
Learning to Write**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DR. CARL SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

OVERVIEW

ERIC/RCS Learning Packages contain just what the practitioner needs for staff development workshops. Workshops can begin with an overview lecture , continue through readings and discussion material, and end with research projects and an annotated bibliography for further research.

Each learning package contains (1) a topic overview: a four-to-six page stage-setter; (2) in most cases, a digest of research: an ERIC summary of research on the topic written by a specialist; (3) a goal statement and a survey form; and (4) an extensive annotated bibliography of ERIC references.

Graduate-level university credit is available. For further information contact Indiana University School of Continuing Studies, Owen Hall #204, Bloomington, Indiana 47405. Enrollment in each course will be limited.

Peer Response in Learning to Write

by Han-Hau Chao

Lecture

(All references are fully documented in the enclosed bibliography, or in a reference list following the lecture)

Learning has been regarded as independent work for a long time. Writing was viewed from the perspective that composition was a private activity. Students wrote by themselves, and the teacher only commented on students' finished products. Recently, a new focus on writing pedagogy has started a shift from emphasis on written products to emphasis on the writing process. As a way of creating knowledge, writing now is viewed as a collaborative and social activity. School writing is no longer a process through which students prove themselves to the teacher; it is now geared toward helping students experience audience and learn about the purposes of various kinds of writing in peer response groups.

However, if we educators intend to change our classroom practices based on this new approach, we need to reevaluate the pedagogical theories which we learned when we were students. Hence, in this lecture, we will begin with a brief description of the philosophy of group learning. Then we will point out the many changes needed to make the classroom a place which facilitates

group learning. Finally, peer response activities and their benefits will be discussed.

Philosophy of Group Learning

Researchers have begun to notice that the traditional model of individual learning does not correspond with what people usually do in actuality. For example, after reading a newspaper or writing a letter, people often want to share what they found to be interesting or important. Professional message creators, such as writers, advertisers, television and movie producers, rely heavily on information and responses from other people. The traditional approach has limited students' learning because it does not encourage them to learn for their own purposes and interests; instead, they learn only in order to meet the standards set up by their teachers' various measurement activities.

In view of this problem, group sharing and learning should be regarded as an important way to encourage students to learn meaningfully and actively. As described by Clines (1986), a number of contemporary critical perspectives--Marxism, Deconstructionism, Reader Response Theory, and History of Science--have emphasized the social origin of all knowledge and invention, the interrelated and interpersonal nature of meaningful communication, the effect of situational context, and the social force of one's community.

Three features of the philosophy of group learning, based on the opinion of Spear (1988), are concerned with what and how people learn.

1. People can take *responsibility* for their own learning, just as they often do outside the classroom. Learning becomes *purposive*, not reactive, and *operational*, not receptive.
2. Working in small groups encourages people's active participation in the learning process. People generate, contribute and exchange ideas for defining problems and finding solutions.
3. The role of the teacher is to facilitate learning by listening, observing, and interacting with learners as normal people do in questioning and responding.

Social learning involves responsible and active learners who think and solve problems. In reality, if I want to know what car to buy, I would actively collect information from various sources. I would discuss cars with family and friends who know cars well or who have just bought new cars, I would analyze my budget, I would read *Consumer Report*, and I would review the dealers' brochures. The entire learning and deciding process is purposive and active, because I take the responsibility for what I learn and for the results. For this kind of self-motivated learning to occur in the classroom, teachers have to assume the role of facilitator. They need to behave as members of the learning community who

do not dominate the decision-making and learning process, but who act as more experienced learners in the whole learning context, listening, observing, and exchanging opinions with their students.

Characteristics of a Collaborative Classroom

The philosophy of a collaborative partner-centered classroom differs considerably from that of the traditional teacher-centered one. According to Smith (1988, p. 70-72), the characteristics of a collaborative classroom are:

1. No grades--Learning is worthwhile in its own right for its authentic purpose and function.
2. No restrictions--The time, space, and range of a learning activity is not constrained by classroom unit or school/society boundary, but decided by the goals and interests of the learners.
3. No coercion--Interesting and open activities invite learners to engage in the learning situation in order to learn. No one is forced to be involved in an activity which is meaningless or not interesting, and no one is excluded because of insufficient talent or experience.
4. No status--There is no person who is there only to teach or who is there only to be taught. Learning is a mutual partnership in which all partners learn from one another

because everyone is more experienced in some areas and less experienced in some others.

In collaboration, everyone participates and everyone learns; it is impossible to differentiate who has contributed what. Learning requires mutual respect and support, and challenges learners to attempt more things that are interesting and meaningful.

Peer Response for Learning to Write

Writing is a type of lively social communication. Both the writer and reader have to mediate between the text potentials and the possible meanings to make sense. When compared to a verbal conversation, writing is similar to talking, and reading resembles listening. According to Vygotsky (1962), writing, as compared to speech, makes use of more formal and complicated structure and function, yet writing and speech are related thinking and communicative processes. Because of the similarity between speech and writing, the ice-breaking nature of speech interaction for decreasing social and psychological pressures on students, and the proficient oral ability of students before they learn to write, Stay (1985) has concluded that having students talk about writing among themselves is an effective way to help unskilled writers formulate and clarify their ideas. They also gain confidence in themselves, and their writing skills improve. Both Murray (1968) and Graves (1983) proposed that the importance of group conferencing is important because it gives students the ownership

of their writing, it generates respect for individual learning, and it helps students become teachers for themselves and others by developing into responsive audience members. Other discussions of the benefits of using oral peer responses to help students write and interact can be found in some of the studies cited in the reference list appended to this lecture (Reid, 1983; and Spear, 1988).

However, collaboration requires confidence in oneself and respect for and trust in others. Students may not feel comfortable with collaborative efforts at the beginning, since all of their traditional educational experiences require them to be competitive and individual learners rather than collaborative and social interactors. Reid (1983), Benesch (1985), Brady and Jacobs (1988), and Smith (1988) all raise significant points regarding the importance of teacher demonstrations. For example, teachers can demonstrate through student-teacher conferences. Additionally, students can learn how to give feedback by reacting to teacher drafts. Teachers also can participate through writing and comments just as if they were classmembers. Finally, teachers can invite colleagues in to participate in modeling peer discussions in front of the class.

Spear (1988) discussed several strategies to improve students' reading, listening, and feedback. The main goal is to offset the artificiality of a writing class so that writing activities can

be related to students' experiences and purposes, and peer responses can provide positive, empathetic, and content-related reactions. Benson (1987) presented a useful peer group writing curriculum which makes use of freewriting and group discussions to motivate students to conduct research inquiry and write research papers. Learning to write is simply engaging in writing and discussion. All these activities focus on encouraging students to write with genuine intention, with an audience in mind, and with peer support. By mutual sharing and support during pre-writing, writing, revising, and editing, the functions and mechanics of writing are meaningfully learned. Through peer listening, reading, confirming, questioning, clarifying, advising, evaluating, and thinking in the classroom community, eventually students learn to be responsible to their audience and to control their own learning.

You may wonder if peers' written responses are also helpful for students learning to write. There are disadvantages which peer written responses and teacher written comments share; they are not immediate in time and space, and then do not encourage classmembers to learn and think collaboratively. Therefore, oral response in peer discussion is a better way to invite students to think and rethink, and to write and rewrite, for their own purposes and their audience's needs.

References

- Brady, Suzanne and Jacobs, Suzanne. "Children Responding to Children: Writing Groups and Classroom Community," *Understanding Writing--Ways of Observing, Learning, and Teaching*. Ed. Newkirk, Thomas and Atwell, Nancie. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1988, p. 142-150.
- Graves, Donald H. *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1983.
- Murray, Donald. *Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook, 1982.
- Smith, Frank. *Joining the Literacy Club--Further Essays into Education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1988.
- Spear, Karen. *Sharing Writing--Peer Response Groups in English Classes*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc., 1988.
- Vygotsky, L. S. *Thought and Language*. Ed. and Trans. Hanfmann, Eugenia and Vakar, Gertrude. Boston, MA: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1962.

May 1989

DIGEST

Encouraging Revision

Teaching Writing with Peer Response Groups

by Andrea W. Herrmann

Teachers have turned their classrooms into communities of learners, as the focus of writing pedagogy shifts from written products to writing as a process, and as ways of making knowledge—including writing—are viewed from a collaborative or social perspective (Bruffee, 1983; Faigley, 1985). Writing instruction in our classrooms reflects a growing appreciation of the value of talk. By implementing peer writing groups, teachers encourage students to give, seek, and react to oral feedback among themselves as they write, in addition to reacting to the teacher's traditional comments on finished papers. This trend raises the interesting question of what effect peer feedback has on students' revision practices.

Respected teachers and writing theorists have fostered peer groups in high school and college classrooms as a way to encourage students to write and revise. Elbow (1973) promoted the use of "teacherless writing groups"; Murray (1982) recommended that teachers train students to respond constructively to writing in process; Macrorie (1984) discussed the value of creating a "helping circle"; Moffett (1983) suggested that teachers teach students to teach each other; and Bruffee (1983) maintained that getting students "to talk through" the task of writing is a form of collaborative learning that is essential. Using peer response groups, even with young writers, brings positive benefits, according to the descriptive classroom studies conducted by Graves (1983; 1984) and Calkins (1982; 1983).

Peer reactions often help young writers

Hence, writing groups, whose activity is sometimes referred to as "peer conferencing" or "peer collaboration," have become a pedagogical tool in a wide-range of teaching/learning contexts. It should be noted that teachers sometimes have peer groups respond in writing to written drafts from their fellow students. (See, for example, Wauters, 1988.) But more commonly, collaboration provides writers with an opportunity to read their drafts aloud and to discuss them face-to-face with a peer audience while the written product is taking shape. Classroom talk can be a positive aspect in supporting all phases of the writing process (Reid, 1983). Small groups can help apprehensive or blocked writers become more fluent and can provide an audience that assists the writer in revising (Legge, 1980).

Cooperative writing workshops help students discover audience, according to one study of college freshmen (Glassner, 1983). An ethnographic study concerned with talk in a high school classroom community examined whether writers' intuitions and revision strategies, among other things, could be "strengthened within a supportive classroom environment." (Kantor, 1984, p. 75). The study concluded that the development of a peer community fostered growth from egocentrism to audience awareness, and that knowing the audience helped students become more aware of possible strategies for revising.

Ziv (1983) found a pattern in the way the interaction in peer writing groups develops. Early in the semester, students' comments were primarily positive, but included some criticisms of content and form. The writers, however, did not always revise according to the reactions of their peers, and sometimes resented the criticisms. Later in the semester, however, advice from peers was more likely to be heeded because the students offered each other more concrete suggestions for revision.

Some studies indicate mixed effects

Not all the studies of peer reaction show unqualified positive effects on revision, however. Some studies suggest negative consequences as well. Gere and Stevens (1985) looked at a fifth-grade writing class to determine if the oral responses provided by groups to individual writers shaped their subsequent revisions. The study found both positive and negative results. Student writers were challenged by their peers "to clarify, to provide more detail" (p. 95) as the peer reactors asked questions when they were confused, and suggested ways to improve the writing. Some student writers integrated their peers' suggestions into subsequent revisions. Yet there were incidents of unproductive, even hostile, verbal exchange, and in some groups students hurried through the group work in a "robotlike monotone."

A case study of four children with low, average, and high abilities in writing (Russell, 1985) examined the relationship between peer conferencing and revision. The results indicated that in revising, poor writers were dependent on the questions of other students, whereas average and good writers tended to become their own audience and revise on their own.

Another case study conducted with college freshmen (Berkenkotter, 1983, 1984) sought to find out how students interact in their writing groups and whether writers improve their texts as a result of the interactions. The research revealed that the students' attitudes toward assistance from their peers varied considerably, as did the writers' approaches toward revision. One student, Stan, was too immature to heed his audience. Another student, Joann, became vulnerable to unwarranted criticism because she was so sensitive to her peer audience. Although a third student, Pat, felt responsible to his audience, he felt a greater obligation to his emerging text and revised independently of peer suggestions. The study concluded that students writing for an audience of peers do not necessarily benefit from their peers' suggestions.

Peer reaction seems to work in computer-assisted instruction

Preliminary evidence suggests that the nature of peer collaboration and feedback in classrooms where computers are

Dr. Andrea W. Herrmann is Graduate Coordinator and on the faculty at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

used to teach writing differs from that in regular writing classrooms. Under certain conditions, computers as writing tools appear to promote a collaborative environment, both in learning to write and in learning to use the technology (Daiute, 1986; Dickinson, 1986; Herrmann, 1985a, 1985b, 1986; Hocking and Visniesky, 1983; Selfe and Wahlstrom, 1985; Sudol, 1985).

In a classroom of first and second grade children, the computer created a whole new social organization that affected the way the children interacted (Dickinson, 1986). An ethnographic study that described a high school classroom (Herrmann 1985b, 1986) found a similar result. A variety of types of peer collaborations developed, having various kinds of influence on writing and revision; but not all students learned to collaborate successfully. The success the students had in revising their work appeared to depend, in part, on their ability to form effective collaborative relationships.

The literature suggests that the effects of peer comments on revision is not a simple cause and effect matter, but rather a complex one, dependent upon the interrelationship of multiple factors within the evolving social environment of particular classrooms and groups of students. While some of the students studied appeared to benefit from the comments of their peers, not all students in all classrooms did. Some students were unable, unwilling, or even ill-advised to follow peer reactions in revising what they had written. While there may be no one-to-one relationship between peer comments and revision, these studies, particularly the qualitative ones, suggest a range of real and potential benefits for students participating in an effective community of responsive peers.

References

- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Student writers and their audiences: Case studies of the revising decisions of three college freshmen." Paper presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 14 pp. [ED 236 618]
- Berkenkotter, Carol. "Student writers and their sense of authority over texts," *College Composition and Communication*, 35, (3) 1984, pp. 312-319.
- Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Writing and reading as collaborative or social acts." In *The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking*, pp. 159-169. Janice N. Hays, et al. (Eds.) Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983. 261 pp. [ED 233 366]
- Calkins, Lucy McCormick. "A study of children's rewriting." Final Report for NCTE Research Foundation project No. 80:11, 1982. 405 pp. [ED 229 750]
- Calkins, Lucy McCormick. *Lessons from a Child: On the Teaching and Learning of Writing*. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1983. [ED 263 614; not available from EDRS]
- Daiute, Colette. "Do 1 and 1 make 2? Patterns of influence by collaborative authors," *Written Communication*, 3, (3) 1986, pp. 382-408.
- Dickinson, David K. "Cooperation, collaboration, and a computer: Integrating a computer into a first-second grade writing program," *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20, (4) 1986, pp. 357-378.
- Elbow, Peter. *Writing without Teachers*. New York: Oxford, 1973.
- Faigley, Lester. "Nonacademic writing: The social perspective." In *Writing in Nonacademic Settings*, pp. 231-340. Less Odell and Dixie Goswami (Eds.) New York: Guilford Press, 1985.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles, and Stevens, Ralph S. "The language of writing groups: How oral response shapes revision." In *The Acquisition of Written Language: Response and Revision*, Sara Warshauer Freedman (Ed.), pp. 85-105. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1985. [ED 265 553; not available from EDRS]
- Glassner, Benjamin M. "Discovering audience/inventing purpose: A case study of revision in a cooperative writing workshop." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. 9 pp. [ED 227 513]
- Graves, Donald H. *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1983.
- Graves, Donald H. *A Researcher Learns to Write: Selected Articles and Monographs*. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1984.
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "Collaboration in a high school computers and writing class: An ethnographic study." Paper presented at the 36th Annual Meeting of the College Composition and Communication Conference, 1985a. 19 pp. [ED 258 256]
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "Using the computer as a writing tool: Ethnography of a high school writing class," Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1985b. [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1986, No. 86-02, 051]
- Herrmann, Andrea W. "An ethnographic study of a high school writing class using computers: Marginal, technically proficient, and productive learners." In *Writing at Century's End: Essays on Computer-Assisted Composition*, pp. 79-91. Lisa Gerrard (Ed.) New York: Random House, 1986.
- Hocking, Joan, and Visniesky, Cheryl. "Incorporating the microcomputer into the traditional English classroom." Paper presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Northeast Regional Conference on English in the Two-Year College, 1983. 14 pp. [ED 240 612]
- Kantor, Kenneth J. "Classroom contexts and the development of writing intuitions: An ethnographic case study." In *New Directions in Composition Research*, pp. 72-94. New York: Guilford, 1984. [ED 250 682]
- Legge, Anne L. "Small groups in college writing classes: Why and how," 1980. [ED 204 803]
- Macrorie, Ken. *Writing to be Read*. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1984.
- Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983.
- Murray, Donald. *Learning by Teaching: Selected Articles on Writing and Teaching*. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 1982. [ED 230 962; not available from EDRS]
- Reid, Louann. "Talking: The neglected part of the writing process." Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Conference, 1983. 10 pp. [ED 229 762]
- Russell, Connie. "Peer conferencing and writing revision: A study of the relationship." Service Bulletin No. 48, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English, 1985. 25 pp. [ED 260 392]
- Selfe, Cynthia L., and Wahlstrom, Billie J. "An emerging rhetoric of collaboration: Computers and the composing process." Paper presented at the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1985. 19 pp. [ED 261 384]
- Sudol, Ronald A. "Applied word processing: Notes on authority, responsibility, and revision in a workshop model," *College Composition and Communication*, 36, (3) 1985, pp. 331-335.
- Wauters, Joan K. "Non-confrontational critiquing pairs: An alternative to verbal peer response groups," *Writing Instructor*, 7, (3-4) 1988, pp. 156-165.
- Ziv, Nina D. "Peer groups in the composition classroom: A case study." Paper presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 1983. 11 pp. [ED 229 799]

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills

Indiana University
2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 150
Bloomington, IN 47408
(812) 855-5847

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. R188062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Task #1

Goal Statement

Your Name: _____

Course #: _____

Learning package: _____

The purpose of writing a goal statement is to create an expectation for yourself, to establish a purpose that you can check when you have finished reviewing the package of materials. It should be used in conjunction with your reaction statement--the commentary that you will make after working your way through the materials in the learning package.

Directions: This is a pre-reading activity. Think about the topic of this package and then look at the various materials, primarily reviewing their headlines and subheads. What does that review prompt you to want to discover through this package?

Write a goal statement of no more than one paragraph that includes the questions that you want answered or the kinds of applications that you hope the package will help you accomplish in your work. Attached please find examples of representative goal statements submitted by former students.

Mail a copy of your goal statement to your instructor. Please keep a copy for yourself because your reaction statement should be based partly on the goal statement.

My Goal Statement for this Package

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Examples of Goal Statements

It is my expectation that this learning package will direct me in new directions so that I may improve my instruction in the area of vocabulary. I would like to know when it is best to introduce new vocabulary words. I would also like to gain information about new methods one might use when introducing new vocabulary. I expect to read about some of the newest research related to vocabulary instruction. It is also expected that tested methods will be described and examined. I would hope that these articles would help me improve how I teach so that my students will benefit and become better readers.

Following the study of this package, I expect to increase my understanding of computer usage in reading development, learn how to integrate computers into reading and writing instruction for learning impaired students, and make decisions on the usefulness of computer games in the classroom.

Following completion of this package I intend to:

- 1) Identify the components of a formal reading program evaluation.
- 2) Analyze the characteristics of an effective reading program.
- 3) Develop evaluation strategies that will improve the monitoring of my program objectives.

Task #2

Reaction Statement

You are asked to type a four-page reaction to this learning package as a way of firming up your sense of what you find interesting, important, or beneficial in this group of materials. You should construct this reaction with your previously established goal statement in mind.

Given below are a number of prompts to indicate the kinds of questions that you might wish to answer in developing this reaction. You may use other questions than those that are here listed. We anticipate that your reaction will be approximately four typewritten, double-spaced pages. Please use the following format in heading your paper.

Reaction

Your Name: _____

Course #: _____

Learning Package: _____

Reaction Prompts

1. Were your goals realized, and how do you know? (Refer to your goal statement.)
2. What important or beneficial ideas did you find in these materials? (Please cite the articles.)
3. Are there trends or concerns in the materials that bother you? Are there those that you agree with? Discuss. (Please use the annotated bibliography and cite ideas from it.)
4. What ideas did you want to try in your daily work world? Describe how you could apply these ideas?

Application Project

If you decide to use this topic for one of your two application projects, you may want to spend more time thinking about ways that you could explore one or more of these ideas in your work.

When you have finished your statement, please mail it to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Task #3

Application Project

As you select your two application projects, use the following guidelines:

1. **Formulate a question** that you would like to answer regarding this topic. (For example, can my slow readers use some of the self-monitoring strategies discussed in these materials?) A question often helps to clarify the kinds of information that you will collect or the kinds of evidence that you will use to convince a reader that you are pursuing an interesting question.
2. **Describe with as much detail** as is needed for a reader to understand what you did, what materials you used, what major procedures you used, what evidence you were looking for, in order to answer your question.
3. **Gather evidence** from your students or from teachers to show samples of the kinds of work or the kinds of interactions that were taking place. These samples may be your written observations, sample student papers, photographs, activity sheets, book titles, statistical data, or any other kind of evidence that demonstrates the reality of your inquiry.
4. **Write a summary** of your plan and of your conclusions. The summary should be coherent and clear so a person who was not on site can understand what you attempted and can appreciate the conclusions that you drew.
5. **Send a report** that includes a summary of your plan, sample evidence of what you found, a brief analysis of the evidence, and the conclusions that you
6. **Provide a cover page** that gives your name, address, course number, topic of learning package, and topic of your project. We will mail you a critique of your work. Send your report to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Course Number _____

Date _____

Package Title _____

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. This package will help me do my job better.					
2. The pace of the package was too fast.					
3. The package's directions were confusing.					
4. It was easy to follow the directions given in the package.					
5. The package was too easy.					
6. The package was too long.					
7. The package should include more articles and documents to read.					
8. I didn't know the meaning of many words used in the package.					
9. The lecture explicated the topic of the package.					
10. The package's objectives were clear from the start.					
11. The package's teaching points were clear.					

What did you like best about the package?

What did you like least about the package?

How would you improve the package?

Please list other topics you would be interested in studying through our program.

Name (optional)_____

Position_____

Years Taught_____

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

PEER RESPONSE IN LEARNING TO WRITE

ERIC/RCS

Selected Abstracts from the ERIC Database



**ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading & Communication Skills
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
(812) 855-5847**

Sample ERIC Abstract

AN ED289160
 AU Binkley,-Marilyn-R.; And-Others
 TI Becoming a Nation of Readers: What Parents Can Do.
 CS Heath (D.C.) and Co., Lexington, Mass.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
 PY 1988
 AV What Parents Can Do, Consumer Information Center, Pueblo, CO 81009 (\$.50).
 NT 40 p.; For Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading, see ED 253 865.
 PR EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DE Beginning-Reading; Literacy-Education; Parent-Attitudes; Parent-Child-Relationship; Preschool-Children; Primary-Education; Reading-Aloud-to-Others; Reading-Attitudes; Recreational-Reading; Written-Language
 DE *Literacy-; *Parent-Influence; *Parent-Participation; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Processes
 ID Reading-Motivation
 AB Intended for parents and based on the premise that parents are their children's first and most important teachers, this booklet is a distillation of findings from the 1984 report of the Commission on Reading, "Becoming a Nation of Readers." The introduction reiterates the Commission's conclusions (1) that a parent is a child's first tutor in unraveling the puzzle of written language; (2) that parents should read to preschool children and informally teach them about reading and writing; and (3) that parents should support school-aged children's continued growth as readers. Chapter 1 defines reading as the process of constructing meaning from written texts, a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information. Chapter 2, on the preschool years, focuses on talking to the young child, reading aloud to the preschooler, and teaching children about written language. The third chapter, on beginning reading, counsels parents on what to look for in good beginning reading programs in schools, and how to help the child with reading at home. The fourth chapter, on developing readers and making reading an integral part of learning, offers suggestions for helping the child succeed in school and for encouraging reading for fun. The afterword calls on teachers, publishers, and school personnel, as well as parents, to participate actively in creating a literate society. The booklet concludes with a list of organizations that provide practical help or publications for parents.

Interpretation of ERIC Abstract Field Identifiers

AN ERIC accession number (Use this number when ordering microfiche and paper copies.)
 AU Author(s)
 TI Title
 CS Corporate source
 PY Actual or approximate publication date
 AV Source and price (availability)
 NT Pagination and additional information (such as legibility or related documents)
 PR Indicates availability of document from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service
 DE Descriptors-indexing terms from the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* which indicate important concepts in the document
 ID Identifiers-indexing terms not included in the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors*
 AB Summary

AN: ED243113
 AU: Benesch, -Sarah
 TI: Improving Peer Response: Collaboration between Teachers and Students.
 PY: 1984
 NT: 11 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (35th, New York City, NY, March 29-31, 1984).
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DE: Communication-Skills; Cooperation-; Group-Discussion; Higher-Education; Interpersonal-Communication; Teacher-Role; Writing-Evaluation
 DE: *Discussion-Teaching-Technique; *Feedback-;
 *Modeling-Psychology; *Peer-Evaluation; *Reader-Response;
 *Writing-Instruction
 AB: As an alternative to using written guidelines to direct peer feedback on student writing, teachers can allow students to use their own language and conversational habits in peer group conversations and then monitor peer feedback while modeling the type that is most conducive to true exchange. To create a collaboratively run writing workshop, teachers must first determine where students are in writing, in responding to writing, and in collaborating and then decide on the learning goals for the semester. Teachers can model effective feedback both in their written comments on student papers and by responding to student feedback to their own writing. They can monitor peer feedback by taping and transcribing selected discussions. With these transcripts, teachers can determine if, in their own language, students are raising important issues in the writing process. Instructors can also use the transcripts in class discussions to help students see how susceptible their language is to different interpretations and to help them move toward a more complete response to the writing they read. (MM)

AN: EJ318168
 AU: Benesch, -Sarah
 TI: Improving Peer Response: Collaboration between Teachers and Students.
 PY: 1985
 JN: Journal-of-Teaching-Writing; v4 n1 p87-94 Spr 1985
 DE: Feedback-; Group-Instruction; Higher-Education; Interpersonal-Communication; Peer-Groups; Writing-Evaluation
 DE: *Cooperation-; *Peer-Evaluation; *Teacher-Response;
 *Teacher-Role; *Teacher-Student-Relationship;
 *Writing-Instruction
 AB: By allowing students to enter imperfectly into peer group conversations with their own language and conversational habits and then monitoring their feedback while modeling the type that is most conducive to promoting true exchange, teachers can facilitate successful and satisfying ways of talking about writing. (HOD)

AN: ED262413
 AU: Benesch, -Sarah
 TI: Metaresponse: A Hidden Benefit of Peer Writing Instruction.
 PY: 1985
 NT: 13 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English Spring Conference (4th, Houston, TX, March 28-30, 1985).
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DE: Cognitive-Processes; Higher-Education; Peer-Groups; Writing-Evaluation; Writing-Processes
 DE: *Peer-Evaluation; *Peer-Teaching; *Writing-Composition; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Research
 AB: In order to find out what a three-member peer group in freshman composition was discussing during their meetings and how--if at all--they talked about writing, their conversations about their first drafts for the class were taped and analyzed. Analysis showed that in addition to discussion of their drafts (text talk) and social chat (off-task talk), the students also talked about the assignment, group procedures, and feedback (metaresponse). Of the five categories (text, assignment, metaresponse, procedures, and off-task), metaresponse revealed the most about what the students were and were not doing in the group. It gave them a way to vent frustration, express confusion, and negotiate new ways of interacting, while providing feedback for the teacher. Analysis showed that more inservice training in reading, responding, and using feedback to revise would have been helpful, and pointed to the problems caused by using teacher-generated assignments in a workshop that was supposed to be collaboratively run. Perhaps most importantly, findings indicated that when students are given some instruction in reading and responding to one another's drafts, they may spend time discussing the complexity of reading and writing. Peer writing instruction provides group members with the opportunity to discover and discuss the difficulties of composing, reading, responding, and revising. (DF)

AN: EJ360673
 AU: Benson, -Linda-K.
 TI: How to Pluck an Albatross: The Research Paper without Tears.
 PY: 1987
 JN: English-Journal; v76 n7 p54-56 Nov 1987
 AV: UMI
 DE: Course-Content; Educational-Theories; English-Instruction; Expository-Writing; Grade-11; Heuristics-; Prewriting-; Secondary-Education; Student-Attitudes; Writing-Composition
 DE: *Assignments-; *Group-Discussion; *Research-Papers-Students; *Research-Skills; *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Instruction
 AB: Discusses a method for involving students in topics so that research evolves from a desire to know. Describes using response

group discussion about real life problems to find topics, freewriting loops, and class presentation before and during research. Reports positive atmosphere and interest. (JG)

AN: ED285178

AU: Bishop, -Wendy

TI: Revising the Technical Writing Class: Peer Critiques, Self-Evaluation and Portfolio Grading.

PY: 1987

NT: 26 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition (6th, State College, PA, July 7-10, 1987).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DE: Higher-Education; Process-Education; Reader-Response; Revision-Written-Composition; Small-Group-Instruction;

Teaching-Methods; Writing-Evaluation; Writing-Exercises

DE: *Business-English; *Course-Content; *Peer-Evaluation;

*Technical-Writing; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes

AB: A process oriented technical writing course was devised at the University of Alaska to counteract the "forms" approach and to include peer critiques and student participation in class grading. Modifications to the standard syllabus included (1) student analyses of their own writing processes through literacy autobiographies, (2) student interviews with practitioners in different fields to identify types and kinds of writing done in those fields, (3) discussions of paper types and textbook readings leading to student-generated critique sheets, (4) conference based reviews of peer-completed critique sheets, and (5) compilation of extensively revised, carefully self-evaluated portfolios of technical writing (graded at midterm and at semester's end). By sharing the first two assignments in peer writing groups, students learn that they have many writing experiences in common (e.g. writing block), and also find that most professionals in their fields spend over 50% of their time in writing-related activities. Students produce drafts at three levels: rough (self-critiqued outside of class), professional (submitted for class critiquing), and portfolio (turned in for a grade). This critiquing cycle ensures that each paper undergoes multiple revisions. The class-generated evaluation guides rate attributes of each paper type, and emphasize the importance of communicating to a broad audience. Portfolios include earlier drafts, a prompt-assisted student self-evaluation, and a self-grade. (Peer evaluation checklists, portfolio cycle flow chart, student writing excerpts, and assignment sheets are included.) (JG)

AN: ED294176

AU: Brown, -Byron-K.

TI: From Heuristics to Hermeneutics: Aiding Invention in the Undergraduate Literature Class.

PY: 1988

NT: 12 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (39th, St. Louis, MO, March 17-19, 1988).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Critical-Thinking; Cultural-Context; Heuristics-; Higher-Education; Literature-; Literature-Appreciation; Rhetorical-Criticism; Teaching-Methods; Undergraduate-Study
DE: *Critical-Reading; *Literary-Criticism; *Reader-Response; *Semiotics-

AB: To help students develop a broadly generative approach to reading and writing about literature, teachers of literature should employ not only systematic procedures, but also the eclectic and utilitarian spirit of rhetorical invention. A semiotic perspective offers the most solid theoretical foundation for establishing a genuinely heuristic approach to texts, one capable of encompassing and organizing a variety of interpretive schemata. Using a grid format to illustrate the multiple perspectives that semiotics bring to texts, students are encouraged to examine texts through the two overlapping perspectives--linguistic and cultural--implicit in structuralist and semiotic readings. The linguistic perspective, with categories of repetition, variation, and progression, explores significance as both static (focusing on the oppositions of similarity/dissimilarity, resemblance/difference, or repetition/variation) and dynamic (the progressive unfolding of meaning through shifting relationships generated by the sequential appearance of textual features). From the cultural perspective--in categories of text, literary context, author, and social context--students examine the codes that shape the text's production, considering the work's textuality, intertextuality, and extratextuality. Such a rhetorically-generated grid, drawing on both configurations and extratextual considerations, can simultaneously identify competing interpretive centers while placing them in relation to each other, allowing students to experience interpretation as a creative act. (A chart of the interacting perspectives of linguistic and cultural phenomena is included, and eight references are appended.) (MM)

AN: ED269789

AU: Clines, -Raymond-H.

TI: Collaboration and the Inadequacy of Current Models of Composition.

PY: 1986

NT: 12 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (37th, New Orleans, LA, March 13-15, 1986).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Higher-Education; Secondary-Education

DE: *Cooperation-; *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes

AB: While models of expressive writing are supposed to encourage individuals to look within and release what is good and true, growing up with such a model may be counterproductive in that writers may never learn to take advantage of social interaction that might be of help in the invention and prewriting stage, and thus fail to realize the benefits of collaboration. Another failing of the current models for composition is that those who learn that writing is a solitary act will feel that if they do not write, they have only themselves to blame. It does not occur to them to consider that the ways they interact with others and with social collectives could have something to do with writing failures as well as successes. Almost nowhere in current composition theory or pedagogy does one find out about writing jointly with others, or about writing negotiatively in constrained settings, or about the important role that resonating relationships play in writing. Thus, it is not surprising that when teachers do try to incorporate collaborative teaching techniques in the classroom, they fail. Organizing collaborative learning effectively may require new and more thorough analyses of the elements of the composition field than have been attempted. A number of contemporary critical perspectives may help point the direction that such analyses could take, especially if teachers are to develop the kind of theoretical framework that would make collaboration truly workable. For example, Marxist, deconstructionist, reader-response, and certain scientific theories all counter the notion of the isolated writer. Viewing writing in a collaborative context means that writing teachers must acknowledge that they cannot always solve writing problems by working with individuals alone. (HTH)

AN: ED281192

AU: Coleman, -Eve

TI: Response Groups as a Source of Data for Classroom Based Research.

PY: 1987

NT: 21 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (38th, Atlanta, GA, March 19-21, 1987).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Classroom-Research; Group-Instruction; Higher-Education; Peer-Evaluation; Remedial-Instruction; Tutorial-Programs; Writing-Evaluation; Writing-Research

DE: *Peer-Teaching; *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes

AB: The investigation of peer response groups in a basic college writing class was one method of charting the development of students' writing skills over the span of a semester to see if collaborative learning was beneficial to the writing process. Response groups were tape-recorded and observed, and members were interviewed. By the fourth week of the semester it was clear that the students had begun to develop an awareness of the need to

examine their compositions for considerations other than mere surface errors. They had begun to "re-see" their drafts as a result of comments made in response groups. As time went on, the participants interrupted themselves more frequently and seemed to be mentally planning revisions as they made self-directed comments about their papers--a skill often lacking in inexperienced writers. These basic writers began to develop the fluency needed to write "passionately," after practicing their critical skills on others. In the collaborative learning situation of the response group they had begun to do more of the kinds of things seasoned writers do--experiencing dissonance, doing more self-monitoring, and beginning to write and read critically. (Transparencies used in the presentation are included, and figures and references are appended.) (NKA)

AN: ED243122

AU: Collins,-Jeffrey-L.

TI: Establishing Peer Evaluation of Writing: Students Need an Informed Teacher Model.

PY: [1983]

NT: 11 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Elementary-Education; Feedback-; Peer-Teaching; Reader-Response; Student-Teacher-Relationship; Teacher-Response; Writing-Improvement

DE: *Conferences-; *Peer-Evaluation; *Student-Reaction; *Teacher-Role; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Instruction

AB: Peer evaluation of writing, or conferencing, is a helping process in which the teacher or other students receive and respond to the writer's work. It promotes the writer's sense of ownership of the work and thus helps develop writing skills. A writing program that includes peer evaluation, then, is one that provides a setting in which the young writer can flourish. The key to the success of conferencing lies in the teacher's initial modelling of the process. This modelling requires great commitment to, and understanding of, the principles upon which conferencing and the entire writing program are based. The conferencing method is best implemented when the teacher or peers show respect for the writer's process and product. Conferencing helps develop the skills for receiving the author's work and reflecting on it so the writer can profit by the use of a sounding board--a real, responding audience. Furthermore, it encourages peers to respond as true readers would, thus helping them develop a sense of which parts to assist the writer in improving at the time. This process allows the writer to develop a communication sense in an accepting atmosphere. Therein lies the beauty of the conferencing method. Children learn to write by writing and by adjusting their perceptions of their writing with the aid of audience response. (HOD)

AN: EJ377380
 AU: Danis, -M.-Francine
 TI: Catching the Drift: Keeping Peer-Response Groups on Track.
 PY: 1988
 JN: College-Composition-and-Communication; v39 n3 p356-58 Oct 1988
 AV: UMI
 DE: Group-Discussion; Group-Guidance; Higher-Education; Reader-Response; Teaching-Methods; Writing-Instruction
 DE: *Peer-Evaluation
 AB: Describes how observation-writing (noncritical, written observations of a peer's writing) can be an effective technique for guiding student discussions in peer-response groups. (MM)

AN: ED285154
 AU: David, -Denise-L.
 TI: An Ethnographic Investigation of Talk in Small Group Writing Workshops in a College Writing Class.
 PY: [1985]
 NT: 51 p.
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
 DE: Discourse-Analysis; Group-Discussion; Higher-Education; Peer-Teaching; Revision-Written-Composition; Self-Directed-Groups; Teaching-Methods; Writing-Processes; Writing-Research
 DE: *Group-Behavior; *Peer-Evaluation; *Small-Group-Instruction; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Improvement; *Writing-Instruction
 AB: To understand the nature of talk in small group writing workshops, including the way talk changes over time and the use students make of such talk, a study analyzed the conversations of 17 inexperienced college writers as they composed and revised self-selected pieces during a one-semester composition course. A student from the course who did not participate in a writing group was selected to analyze tape recordings of the group sessions. The recorded conversation was divided into four categories: (1) talk in response to the pieces, (2) talk to establish the emotional climate, (3) talk to move the group along, and (4) talk addressed to the listeners of the tape. Results of the analysis suggested that the largest category, talk in response to the group members' papers, remained the same or increased over time, while talk addressed to the listeners of the tape disappeared over time. The use of conversation to help one another clarify ideas varied from session to session, but there is evidence in later papers that the students' writing had benefited from more careful thinking and peer evaluation. The study reaffirms the potential value of small group response sessions in the classroom. (Thirty-six references are included.) (JC)

AN: ED282229

AU: DiPardo,-Anne; Freedman,-Sarah-Warshauer
 TI: Historical Overview: Groups in the Writing Classroom.
 Technical Report No. 4.
 CS: California Univ., Berkeley. Center for the Study of Writing.
 PY: 1987
 NT: 21 p.
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DE: Interaction-; Language-Acquisition; Learning-Processes;
 Peer-Teaching; Teacher-Response; Teacher-Role; Teaching-Methods;
 Writing-Research
 DE: *Educational-History; *Grouping-Instructional-Purposes;
 *Peer-Groups; *Theory-Practice-Relationship;
 *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes
 AB: Arguing that the use of peer groups in a writing classroom
 theoretically supports the goals of the paradigm shift from
 emphasis on written product to writing process that has occurred
 in recent years, this paper examines the complexities confronting
 teachers who attempt to use groups for instructional purposes.
 Following a brief introduction, the first section of the paper
 traces the emergence of the use of peer groups in the writing
 classroom, touching upon the shift from product to process to
 collaboration and upon research in the area of collaborative and
 group learning. The second section of the paper discusses how
 language learning theory supports group work. In particular, this
 section examines the social context of schools and theories of
 language learning and the various features of collaboration. The
 third section looks at research on peer response, and the final
 section discusses future research directions. A five-page list of
 references concludes the paper. (FL)

AN: EJ359113
 AU: Duin,-Ann-Hill
 TI: Implementing Cooperative Learning Groups in the Writing
 Curriculum.
 PY: 1986
 JN: Journal-of-Teaching-Writing; v5 n2 p315-23 Fall 1986
 DE: Expository-Writing; Heuristics-; High-Schools;
 Small-Group-Instruction; Writing-Exercises
 DE: *Group-Activities; *Group-Dynamics; *Learning-Activities;
 *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes
 AB: Noting that students in groups learn more effectively when
 working cooperatively than when working competitively or
 individualistically, presents guidelines, assignments, and class
 activities designed to foster cooperative learning. Describes
 such student-student interaction sessions as describing sense
 perception details, receiving peer feedback, and sharing
 prewriting to compose a multiauthor paper. (JG)

AN: EJ331282
 AU: Ede,-Lisa; Lunsford,-Andrea

TI: Let Them Write--Together.

PY: 1985

JN: English-Quarterly; v18 n4 p119-27 Win 1985

DE: English-Instruction; Higher-Education; Peer-Evaluation;

Peer-Groups; Peer-Teaching; Secondary-Education;

Student-Reaction; Writing-Processes; Writing-Skills

DE: *Cooperation-; *Group-Activities; *Reader-Response;

*Theory-Practice-Relationship; *Writing-Instruction

AB: Argues, in a discussion of the benefits of collaborative writing, that teaching writing as a solitary activity belies actual experience and research pointing to it as a collaborative effort. Shows how to use peer response groups to introduce students to collaborative writing. (EL)

AN: ED287171

AU: Freedman, -Sarah-Warshauer

TI: Peer Response Groups in Two Ninth-Grade Classrooms. Technical Report No. 12.

CS: Center for the Study of Writing, Berkeley, CA.

PY: 1987

AV: Center for the Study of Writing, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley CA 92720 (\$3.00, plus sales tax for California residents; make check payable to Regents of U.C.).

NT: 33 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DE: Class-Activities; Classroom-Observation-Techniques;

Classroom-Research; Ethnography-; Grade-9; Group-Dynamics;

Interaction-Process-Analysis; Junior-High-Schools;

Naturalistic-Observation; Student-Behavior; Teacher-Behavior;

Teacher-Role; Teacher-Student-Relationship; Teaching-Methods;

Writing-Processes; Writing-Research

DE: *Group-Discussion; *Peer-Evaluation; *Peer-Groups;

*Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Instruction

AB: A study examined peer response groups in two ninth grade English classes. The study specifically investigated research considerations including: (1) the teachers' use of response groups; (2) the kinds of response the students give themselves in response groups; and (3) the connection between student response and the teachers' directions to the groups. Subjects, 60 students in two schools in the San Francisco area, were observed for 17 weeks. Data collection consisted of daily videotaping and audiotaping of whole class discussions and of peer response groups, ethnographic note taking, and collection of all writing materials prepared by teachers and students. Results indicated that peer response groups can help students respond to their own work. When talk about content was initiated, members of the groups encouraged and questioned one another and demonstrated ownership of their writing. However, the students avoided talk that involved evaluation of another student's writing and never played the role of teacher. The students rarely discussed real

writing problems and resisted the teacher-directed response on dittoed response sheets. Findings suggest that groups will work differently in different classrooms and with different ages and types of students. In one classroom, peers responded to one another's writing in order to develop evaluative skills, while in the other classroom, the response group functions so that students can collaborate around the discovery of one element of the writing craft, which is then discussed in whole class discussions. (Tables of data are included, and notes and references are attached.) (NKA)

AN: ED229781

AU: Gere,-Anne-R.

TI: Students' Oral Response to Written Composition.

CS: Washington Univ., Seattle.

PY: [1982]

NT: 135 p.; Contains a number of marginally legible pages.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Oral-Language; Peer-Groups; Writing-Exercises

DE: *Language-Usage; *Peer-Evaluation;

*Revision-Written-Composition; *Student-Reaction;

*Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Research

AB: A study examined the oral comments of writing groups at different grade levels to determine if students are actually able to talk about writing, what kinds of comments they make about each other's writing, and what effects their comments have on the composing process. Nine groups of from four to six members in the fifth, eighth, and senior high grades were tape recorded in from three to six meetings. Transcripts were used to develop three language categories based on function: directing, informing, and eliciting. All transcripts were then analyzed to determine the incidence of each function for each meeting of the groups. Revisions of papers that had been read and commented on in the groups were then analyzed to determine the relationship between the comments made and the changes in the writing. Results indicated that group responses were directed to the writing and were largely informative, providing directions to the writer about how a composition could be changed and improved. This idea was confirmed by the fact that revised papers did show change and improvement. (Suggestions for further research, sample transcripts and student papers are included.) (JL)

AN: ED224048

AU: Gere,-Anne-Ruggles

TI: Investigating Language Function in Students' Oral Response to Written Composition.

PY: 1982

NT: 16 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (72nd, Washington, DC, November

19-24, 1982).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Communication-Research; Elementary-Secondary-Education;
Interaction-; Language-Role; Peer-Groups; Speech-Communication;
Writing-Instruction

DE: *Language-Usage; *Oral-Language; *Peer-Evaluation;

DE: *Language-Usage; *Oral-Language; *Peer-Evaluation;

*Student-Reaction; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Research

AB: To learn more about the kind of learning that occurs when students read and receive response to their writing, a study was designed to develop an analytical system by which to describe the language of writing groups. Nine writing groups were examined, two from grade 5, four from grade 8, and three from grades 10 through 12. The data collected included 5,000 idea units contained in 36 transcripts of the student writing groups. The idea units in the transcripts were coded for three general functions: directing, informing, and eliciting. Results showed a high percentage of directive function in the language of students. Students directed group procedures with statements such as "Okay, let's get started." They also made directive statements about one another's writing. The informing function was the most common, and like the directing function, it included both writing and the group among its topics. Students informed one another about group procedures and about their writing. Writers not only received considerable information from others in the writing group, they also learned about themselves. The process of reading aloud made writers more aware of their own language. The least frequently occurring function was eliciting. Students used this function primarily to ask questions about procedures or to solicit advice from the group. (A sample coded transcript is appended.) (HOD)

AN: EJ373594

AU: Jacobs,-George

TI: Co-operative Goal Structure: A Way to Improve Group Activities.

PY: 1988

JN: ELT-Journal; v42 n2 p97-101 Apr 1988

AV: UMI

DE: Academic-Achievement; Classroom-Environment; Cooperation-;
Course-Objectives; English-Second-Language; Feedback-;
Foreign-Countries; Grading-; Teaching-Methods

DE: *College-Students; *Group-Activities;

*Second-Language-Instruction; *Student-Attitudes;

*Writing-Instruction

AB: Three principal types of goal structure are (1) cooperative; (2) competitive; and (3) individualistic. Specifically designed cooperatively structured group activities can improve group performance and attitudes in class. A writing class for English majors is briefly described and evaluated before and after goal structure was considered. Grade averaging helped encourage

cooperation. (Author/LMO)

AN: ED277025

AU: Kasten,-Wendy-C.; Clarke,-Barbara-K.

TI: A Study of 3rd and 5th Grade Students' Oral Language during the Writing Process in Elementary Classrooms.

PY: 1986

NT: 29 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association World Congress on Reading (11th, London, England, July 27-31, 1986).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DE: Classroom-Environment; Elementary-Education; Ethnography-; Writing-Composition; Writing-Research

DE: *Creative-Writing; *Group-Dynamics;

*Interpersonal-Communication; *Language-Processing;

*Oral-Language; *Writing-Processes

AB: Using ethnographic techniques to observe seven fifth grade and seven third grade students, a study examined the function of children's oral language during creative writing sessions in typical classroom situations. Findings indicated that oral language plays an important role in the writing process; specifically, that it (1) accompanies writing as an intrapersonal function, (2) helps writers think about and revise their text, (3) helps writers make decisions about what to write, (4) is highly related to writing and almost entirely on-task, (5) provides opportunities for collaboration to enhance learning opportunities, and (6) helps students talk about and increase their understanding of the writing process. Results suggested that writing in the elementary classroom is a dynamic and whole language cognitive process in which reading, listening, and speaking contribute to students' writing. Analyses revealed that oral language provides students with opportunities to test ideas and sound out the appropriateness of particular words or phrases. The Manual Observation Form--MOF--used for data collection is described and a particular transcript of an MOF is discussed in detail. Data are analyzed according to both Kasten and Halliday codes. Reading aloud and subvocalization are addressed as special issues.) (JD)

AN: EJ356667

AU: Kleine,-Michael

TI: What Freshmen Say--and Might Say--to Each Other about Their Own Writing.

PY: 1985

JN: Journal-of-Teaching-Writing; v4 n2 p216-33 Fall 1985

DE: Freshman-Composition; Group-Dynamics;

Interpersonal-Communication; Language-Usage; Role-Playing; Speech-Communication; Speech-Skills

DE: *Class-Activities; *Expository-Writing; *Peer-Evaluation;

*Revision-Written-Composition; *Student-Role; *Teacher-Role

AB: Analyzes small-group writing conversation among freshman composition students, identifying the following roles: (1) evaluator, (2) immediate reader, (3) role playing audience, and (4) helpful listener. Presents transcripts of student conversations illustrating these roles, and suggests ways to improve what is said. (JG)

AN: ED295164

AU: Kurfiss, -Joanne

TI: Capitalizing on Collaboration: Using Groups To Help Students Write Better Drafts.

PY: 1986

NT: 27 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DE: Critical-Reading; Higher-Education; Teaching-Methods; Writing-Processes; Writing-Skills

DE: *Writing-Exercises; *Writing-Instruction

AB: Students can benefit from collaboration long before they are ready for draft feedback. By analyzing writing assignments, anticipating and diagnosing student problems, and introducing necessary skills through appropriate exercises, students can be provided with cognitive and social supports that help them address the challenges of academic writing. Collaborative exercises supply students with practice in four skill areas: (1) generating and evaluating ideas; (2) summarizing and synthesizing reading material; (3) developing ideas; and (4) critical reading. In the first category, exercises frequently make use of a four-part strategy in which groups generate, select, refine, and evaluate potential ideas. To practice summarizing and synthesizing reading material with the collaborative approach, instructors can assign group summarizing activities using readings from the course, or group-written concluding paragraphs for assigned essays. Collaboration in developing ideas helps students to practice sustaining a line of inquiry, to show logical relationships between ideas, and to anticipate a reader's questions and objections. Finally, collaborative exercises in the critical reading of student texts include "norming," in which students read, respond to, and evaluate essays similar to their own work in progress. These exercises allow students to rehearse important elements of assigned writing projects, free of grade pressures. In addition, students can see how other students handle similar challenges and benefit from feedback on their own and others' efforts. (Twenty references are appended.) (MM)

AN: ED277048

AU: LeFevre, -Karen-Burke

TI: Invention as a Social Act. Studies in Writing & Rhetoric.

CS: Conference on Coll. Composition and Communication, Urbana, Ill.

PY: 1987

AV: Southern Illinois University Press, P.O. Box 3697,
 Carbondale, IL 62901 (\$8.50).
 NT: 186 p.; Foreword by Frank J. D'Angelo.
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
 DE: Authors-; Cognitive-Processes; Cooperation-;
 Curriculum-Development; Dialogs-Literary; Language-Usage;
 Rhetoric-; Rhetorical-Criticism; Social-Behavior
 DE: *Language-Role; *Literary-Criticism; *Rhetorical-Invention;
 *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes; *Writing-Research
 AB: Working from both literary and composition theory, this book
 argues that American composition theory and pedagogy of the
 nineteenth and twentieth centuries is founded on the Platonic
 view that invention is a solitary act in which the individual,
 drawing upon innate knowledge and mental structures, searches for
 the truth, using introspective self examination and heuristic
 methods of various kinds. Invention is then discussed as a social
 act and four perspectives on invention are presented: (1) the
 Platonic perspective, (2) the internal dialogic perspective, (3)
 the collaborative perspective, and (4) the social collective
 perspective. The book concludes with directions for writers,
 researcher, scholars, and teachers including studying writing in
 social contexts, taking note of various kind of people who affect
 invention, encouraging group authorship and other collaborative
 activities, increasing flexible work space for group activities,
 and integrating writing with learning across the curriculum.
 (SRT)

AN: EJ289616
 AU: Mixson,-Imogene-M.
 TI: Making Group-Work Work in the Writing Classroom.
 PY: 1983
 JN: Teaching-English-in-the-Two-Year-College; v10 n1 p57-61 Fall
 1983
 AV: UMI
 DE: Groups-; Poetry-; Prewriting-; Student-Teacher-Relationship;
 Teaching-Methods; Two-Year-Colleges
 DE: *Discussion-Teaching-Technique; *Group-Activities;
 *Group-Dynamics; *Small-Group-Instruction; *Student-Motivation;
 *Writing-Instruction
 AB: Describes several techniques for making discussion groups
 function well in a composition classroom. (AEA)

AN: ED255914
 AU: Nystrand,-Martin
 TI: Learning to Write by Talking about Writing: A Summary of
 Research on Intensive Peer Review in Expository Writing
 Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.
 PY: 1984
 NT: 14 p.
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Higher-Education; Language-Processing; Writing-Composition; Writing-Skills; Written-Language

DE: *Group-Discussion; *Peer-Evaluation; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes; *Writing-Research

AB: Intensive peer review is a method of teaching expository writing developed two years ago by A. N. Doane and now used extensively in freshman expository writing at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Students meet regularly in groups of four three times a week over the course of the term to share and critique each other's writing. The instructor does relatively little direct instruction, and intervention in these groups is minimal. Students taught by peer review make more progress in writing because they see revision as a matter of reconceptualization rather than editing, view their readers as collaborators in a process of communication rather than as judges, give more emphasis to prewriting, have more positive attitudes about writing, and view their composing process as a process of improvisation and experimentation with ideas and text. Talking about writing can help students learn to write because in a good group there will be (1) a collective examination of written texts, (2) a tendency to dwell on the writer's purpose and its articulation with the resulting focus on the sources of trouble and uncertainties of text, (3) a consideration of higher order writing problems such as structure of argument, (4) presentation of arguments, and (5) paragraph development. Peer review requires careful planning, during which the instructor must help students understand what sorts of group interaction will help students learn to write and what sorts will not. (EL)

AN: ED292129

AU: Price, -Marian

TI: Reader Response in the Teaching of Composition.

PY: 1987

NT: 17 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida College English Association (Ocala, FL, February 6, 1987).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Essays-; Higher-Education; Literary-Criticism; Peer-Groups; Student-Writing-Models; Teacher-Student-Relationship; Teaching-Models

DE: *Critical-Reading; *Freshman-Composition; *Reader-Response; *Writing-Processes

AB: As an interesting development in recent literary criticism, reader response can enhance a composition class in many ways. Reader response, by incorporating both intellect and feeling into an aesthetic reaction to literature, restores the subjective aspect that some forms of criticism deny. Three main elements compose the repeated cycle of a reader-response composition class: (1) individual readers respond to the literature in the written form of a reader's journal; (2) group discussion validates individuals' insights, with the class acting as an interpretive community; and (3) students produce essays through a

process of drafting and peer review. In the final essay-writing step, the class community--not the teacher--is seen as the audience, and student writing becomes the text to be read and given a response. The reading journal and reader-response discussion help identify issues that students can explore more fully and formally in their essays. Because the reader-response model insures that individual responses are listened to and respected, it encourages involvement as readers and commitment as writers, and it discourages conformity of thought and the tendency to parrot the teacher's interpretations. (Figures of the authoritarian model and reader-response model are included, and a list of instructions for a reader's journal is appended.) (MM)

AN: ED229762

AU: Reid,-Louann

TI: Talking: The Neglected Part of the Writing Process.

PY: 1983

NT: 10 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English Spring Conference (2nd, Seattle, WA, April 14-16, 1983).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Peer-Evaluation; Revision-Written-Composition; Secondary-Education; Writing-Evaluation; Writing-Exercises; Writing-Processes; Writing-Research

DE: *Classroom-Communication; *Classroom-Techniques;

*Discussion-Teaching-Technique; *Prewriting-;

*Student-Teacher-Relationship; *Writing-Instruction

AB: There are compelling reasons to use talk in the writing classroom to improve both expressive and expository writing. First, speaking is natural, and students come to the writing classroom linguistically well-developed and confident. Second, talking encourages exploration of words by slowing down the thought process without completely stopping it. Third, this

naturalness and ease of speech establishes a comfortable atmosphere in which writers feel free to take risks in writing and in sharing their writing. Talking activities can be helpful during all three stages of the writing process. Prewriting activities include role-playing followed by free writing, or discussing an unusual object before writing about it. Questioning can be a very important activity during the drafting stage. As students begin editing or revising their papers, student-teacher conferences and peer revision can help make the students' communication clearer and more in tune to audience needs. Most important, students must both understand that talking about writing is necessary and observe teachers talking about writing to learn this fact. Once talking about writing becomes important to teachers it will become important to students as well. (HTH)

AN: ED280084

AU: Reither, -James-A.

TI: What Do We Mean by "Collaborative Writing" (And What Difference Might It Make)?

PY: 1987

NT: 12 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (38th, Atlanta, GA, March 19-21, 1987).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Higher-Education; Peer-Relationship; Teamwork-

DE: *Cooperation-; *Writing-Composition; *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Processes

AB: The term "collaborative writing" is a broad term, but should not be confused with coauthorship. Defining collaborative writing as merely coauthoring suggests that students continue producing texts for texts' (and evaluations') sake, whereas defining collaborative writing as community writing implies that students use language and texts to make meaning and community together. Assignments cannot be made "collaborative" or social merely by having students coauthor them. In a collaborative writing effort, individual members of the group gather relevant information and ideas, which are then contributed to the group project. Whatever a group member finds must be presented in such a way that it can become the property of the group. Each piece of information must be: (1) in writing, (2) photocopiable, and (3) comprehensible to and usable by the rest of the group. When involved in collaborative writing, students become engaged in a sequence of textual experiences governed by real purposes, projects, and audiences--situations that require and thus motivate learning writing to carry out individual and communal impulses to come to know, inform, and influence. (AEW)

AN: ED234409

AU: Schuster, -Charles-I.

TI: The Un-Assignment: Writing Groups for Advanced Expository Writers.

PY: 1983

NT: 24 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Wyoming Conference on Freshman and Sophomore English (Laramie, WY, June 27-July 1, 1983).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Advanced-Courses; Course-Descriptions; Course-Organization; Group-Activities; Higher-Education; Student-Participation

DE: *Expository-Writing; *Peer-Evaluation; *Self-Directed-Groups; *Teaching-Methods; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Instruction

AB: To help committed student writers make the transition from school-sponsored to self-sponsored forms of discourse, an advanced expository writing course combines student-chosen writing assignments with a pedagogical structure that promotes a sensitive and critical response to prose. The class is organized into writing groups containing four or five students each. Every week students take turns giving two readings of three or four

pages of new, finished prose. Following the second reading, all group members comment on their responses to the words, tone, organization, and argument of each paper. To increase motivation and provide guidelines for peer evaluations, the teacher listens to and critiques one paper per group every week and offers a quick evaluation of group effectiveness. Writing groups are effective because they (1) consolidate four essential components of rhetorical study--writing, reading, speaking, and listening; (2) encourage writer ownership through self-generated assignments; (3) inspire rising expectations among peer readers; (4) improve the writer's sense of sound and rhythm through oral reading; (5) help listeners develop short-term memory skills; (6) merge audience and writer, subject and response; and (7) show students the value of revising. (An introduction to the course, writing group guidelines, and advice to writers and listeners are appended.) (MM)

AN: ED226369

AU: Selfe,-Cynthia-L.

TI: Using Groups to Pre-Evaluate Papers in the Technical Writing Classroom.

PY: [1981]

NT: 22 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Group-Behavior; Group-Dynamics; Higher-Education; Peer-Evaluation; Role-Playing; Writing-Exercises

DE: *Class-Organization; *Group-Activities; *Teaching-Methods; *Technical-Writing; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Instruction

AB: Technical writing teachers who believe in the fundamental value of group work and its potential for helping students preevaluate their papers must deal with the problems associated with the technique by adding structure to student efforts in the areas of group training, group activities, and group evaluation. Explicitly training students to preevaluate papers lets them know the teacher's standards, gives the teacher the chance to demonstrate and discuss appropriate and inappropriate group interaction behaviors, and shows the students that constructive criticism of a paper need not be devastating. Grading criteria sheets and role playing are two structures that also help groups to succeed. Finally, evaluation of the group process itself by both the students and the teacher gives the students the feedback they need to function as a group. (Appendixes include descriptions of group members' and group leaders' roles, an evaluation criteria sheet, a role playing scenario, and a group evaluation form.) (JL)

AN: ED291090

AU: Slaughter,-Judith-Pollard

TI: A Focus on Revision: Some Teaching Strategies.

PY: [1987]

NT: 12 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: Elementary-Education; Language-Experience-Approach;

Peer-Groups; Teaching-Methods; Writing-Composition;

Writing-Exercises; Writing-Processes; Writing-Skills

DE: *Revision-Written-Composition; *Writing-Improvement;

*Writing-Instruction

AB: Revision, an essential component of the writing process, encompasses two basic elements: rewriting the content to assure clarity, and editing the draft to eliminate mechanical and grammatical errors. It is important for teachers to plan lessons directed specifically toward helping children make more sense of their messages. This document presents a number of strategies designed for teachers (1) to demonstrate to children the need for content revision; (2) to help children clarify the content of their writing; (3) to demonstrate to children the need for editing changes; and (4) to assist children in their editing efforts. The recommended strategy for demonstrating the need for revision presents a writing model that contains mistakes and allows students to suggest improvements. The strategies for teaching revision skills use the language experience approach, and emphasize peer interaction. (ARH)

AN: EJ356669

AU: Stay,-Byron-L.

TI: Talking about Writing: An Approach to Teaching Unskilled Writers.

PY: 1985

JN: Journal-of-Teaching-Writing; v4 n2 p248-52 Fall 1985

DE: Higher-Education; Peer-Evaluation; Remedial-Instruction;

Self-Esteem; Student-Attitudes; Teacher-Role;

Teacher-Student-Relationship; Tutoring-; Writing-Exercises;

Writing-Improvement

DE: *Classroom-Communication; *Integrated-Activities;

*Revision-Written-Composition; *Speech-Skills; *Writing-Skills

AB: Argues that talking helps college writers to formulate and clarify their ideas while they gain confidence. Cites R.

Zoellner's "talk-write" model as an alternative to the segregation of speech and writing. Concludes that small tutoring sessions and full session discussions with developmental students encourage revision. (JG)

AN: ED291075

AU: Stevens,-Robert-J.; And-Others

TI: Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two Field Experiments. Report No. 10.

CS: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, Baltimore, MD.

PY: 1987

NT: 54 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DE: Elementary-Education; Group-Experience;
Instructional-Effectiveness; Language-Arts; Reading-Research;
Reading-Skills; Writing-Composition; Writing-Research

DE: *Cooperative-Planning; *Language-Skills;

*Reading-Writing-Relationship; *Teamwork-

AB: Two studies evaluated a comprehensive cooperative learning approach to elementary reading and writing instruction, called Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC). The subjects in the first study, 461 third- and fourth-grade students in a suburban Maryland school district, were divided into experimental and control groups, with the experimental CIRC groups working in heterogeneous learning teams for all reading, language arts and writing activities. In reading, CIRC students worked with partners during follow-up times on partner reading, decoding, story structure, prediction, and story summary activities related to the basal stories. In writing and language arts, CIRC students used a process approach to writing and peer conferences during planning, revising and editing stages of the process. Subjects in the second study, 450 third- and fourth-grade students were chosen from a wider range of ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds than those in the first, although the second study was an extension and replication of the first. The results of both studies show significant effects in favor of the CIRC students on standardized test measures of reading comprehension, reading vocabulary, language mechanics, language expression and spelling. Also noted were effects favoring CIRC students on writing sample and oral reading measures. (Six tables of data are included, and 51 references are attached.) (NH)

AN: ED269761

AU: Thomas, -Dene-Kay

TI: A Transition from Speaking to Writing: Small-Group Writing Conferences.

PY: 1986

NT: 33 p.

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DE: College-Freshmen; Communication-Skills; Higher-Education;
Verbal-Communication; Writing-Improvement; Writing-Skills

DE: *Group-Dynamics; *Speech-Communication; *Writing-Instruction;
*Writing-Processes; *Writing-Research

AB: A study analyzed the interaction of one freshman composition teacher and four students who met for a series of six conferences during a freshman composition course. The conferences, which were taped and transcribed, provide evidence of the benefits of the conference method of teaching composition. Analysis of the data included identifying the processes of small group interaction, noting parallels between the group process and the writing process, and formulating an audience acquisition model that illustrates important components of students' writing development. Results of the analysis indicated that discussion

focused on writing helps students make the transition from being speakers who are conversationally oriented to being writers who are aware of how other minds perceive the world and who can adapt their writing to the needs of an imagined audience. A 3-page reference list is included. (DF)

AN: ED284284

AU: Whitlock, -Roger

TI: Making Writing Groups Work: Modifying Elbow's Teacherless Writing Group for the Classroom, 1977-1987.

PY: 1987

NT: 9 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (38th, Atlanta, GA, March 19-21, 1987).

PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DE: English-Instruction; Expository-Writing; Group-Dynamics; Higher-Education; Revision-Written-Composition; Secondary-Education; Self-Directed-Groups; Small-Group-Instruction; Teacher-Student-Relationship; Teaching-Methods; Theory-Practice-Relationship; Writing-Instruction; Writing-Processes

DE: *Group-Discussion; *Peer-Evaluation; *Reader-Response;

*Skill-Development; *Team-Training; *Writing-Evaluation

AB: Peter Elbow's concepts of "pointing," "summarizing," "telling," and "showing" can form an effective method for training students to give reader-based feedback to peer writing. In pointing, students jot down all the words and phrases they can remember from an oral reading of a draft. These lists stimulate summarizing, which involves writing down the main idea, feeling, or "center of gravity" of a piece. In telling, students write what occurred within them as they heard the piece read. This is followed by showing, an exercise in which students describe their reading responses in metaphorical terms (e.g. as hearing voices or as visualizing a vegetable), bringing partially conscious responses to the surface. In the ensuing group discussion students read their pointing lists, summaries, and other responses aloud. Authors mark pointing words in their drafts, note sections in the draft that made no impression on the listeners, and are given the listeners' written notes. Additional guidelines limit the duration of reading aloud, the reactions of writers to their listeners' responses ("don't argue, say 'thank you'"), and the amount of revision completed before group evaluation occurs. Student attitudes to such writing groups typically change from initial apprehension to feeling that the groups are very useful. (JG)

AN: EJ312262

AU: Yelon, -Stephen-L.; Cooper, -Colleen-R.

TI: Discussion: A Naturalistic Study of a Teaching Method.

PY: 1984

JN: Instructional-Science; v13 n3 p213-24 Nov 1984
 DE: Classroom-Research; Classroom-Techniques; Higher-Education;
 Literature-Reviews; Writing-Instruction
 DE: *Discussion-Teaching-Technique; *Student-Reaction;
 *Teacher-Behavior; *Teaching-Models
 AB: This study shows how a university writing instructor
 successfully prepares and conducts discussions and handles
 student responses and reviews students' attitudes toward this
 method. The description indicates it is possible to derive a
 realistic model of discussion and implies such operational models
 can be derived for most other teaching methods. (MBR)

AN: ED229799
 AU: Ziv,-Nina-D.
 TI: Peer Groups in the Composition Classroom: A Case Study.
 PY: 1983
 NT: 11 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
 Conference on College Composition and Communication (34th,
 Detroit, MI, March 17-19, 1983).
 PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DE: Classroom-Techniques; College-Freshmen; Expository-Writing;
 Higher-Education; Student-Role; Teacher-Role
 DE: *Peer-Evaluation; *Writing-Evaluation; *Writing-Improvement;
 *Writing-Instruction; *Writing-Research
 AB: A study examined peer group writing evaluation in the
 classroom. Freshmen in expository writing classes were trained at
 the beginning of the semester to respond first to the ideas in
 the essays, and only after giving the writer feedback on this
 level were they to help the writer with mechanics and syntax.
 After being divided into groups of four or five, the students
 read their first drafts aloud, with each peer in turn criticizing
 the writer's work orally and in written comments on the copies.
 These comments were used in writing second drafts, which were
 turned in to the teacher, whose comments were then used for the
 final draft. The peer groups generally followed the same pattern
 of development. In the early stages, the majority of comments
 were positive evaluations of a writer's work. Along with these
 supportive comments were criticisms of content and form, which
 the writers did not always use in their revisions (reflecting
 their resentment at being criticized by someone other than the
 teacher, as well as a lack of experience in revision). Comments
 about grammar, punctuation, and syntax were more helpful. The
 peers were able to pinpoint surface level problems and offer
 solutions. As the semester progressed, the peers began to suggest
 ways that the writer might revise a text instead of merely
 criticizing the writer. (HTH)

GETTING COPIES OF THE ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE ERIC DATABASE:

The items described in the ERIC database have either an "ED" or an "EJ" number in the first field. About 98% of the ED items can be found in the ERIC Microfiche Collection. The ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) in Alexandria, Virginia can produce either microfiche or paper copies of these documents for you. Check the accompanying list of ERIC Price Codes for their current prices.

Alternatively, you may prefer to consult the ERIC Microfiche Collection yourself before choosing documents to copy. Over 600 libraries in the United States subscribe to this collection. To find out which libraries near you have it, you are welcome to call the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills at (812) 855-5847. Most such libraries have equipment on site for inexpensive production of paper copies from the fiche.

For those few ED-numbered items not found in the Microfiche Collection, check the availability (AV) field of the citation to get information about the author, publisher, or other distributor.

Items with an EJ number in the first field of the citation are journal articles. Due to copyright restrictions, ERIC cannot provide copies of these articles. Most large college or university libraries subscribe to the journals in which these articles were published, and the general public can read or copy the articles from their collections. Should you want copies of articles which appeared in journals not owned by your nearest university library, arrangements usually can be made via interlibrary loan; there frequently is a nominal charge for this, which is set by the lending library. If you are a faculty member, staff member, or student at the university, just ask at your library's reference desk.

For all other categories of users, most universities cannot provide interlibrary services. However, public libraries---which are there to serve all area residents---typically are hooked into statewide lending networks designed to ensure that all state residents have access to materials of interest. Ask your local public librarian about interlibrary loan policies, charges, etc.

There are also two professional reprint services which have obtained permission from some journals to sell article copies. These are University Microfilms International (Article Clearinghouse, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106---(800) 732-0616), and the Institute for Scientific Information (Original Article Tear Sheet Service, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104---(800) 523-1850). At the time of this publication, UMI charged \$10.75 per article regardless of length, and ISI charged \$9.50 for the first ten pages, plus \$2.00 for each additional ten pages or fraction thereof. However, please check with them for current prices before ordering.

ERIC Price Codes

PAPER COPY /HARD COPY

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	PRICE
PC 01	1- 25	\$ 2.03
PC 02	26- 50	4.06
PC 03	51- 75	6.09
PC 04	76- 100	8.12
PC 05	101- 125	10.15
PC 06	126- 150	12.18
PC 07	151- 175	14.21
PC 08	176- 200	16.24
PC 09	201- 225	18.27
PC 10	226- 250	20.30
PC 11	251- 275	22.33
PC 12	276- 300	24.36
PC 13	301- 325	26.39
PC 14	326- 350	28.42
PC 15	351- 375	30.45
PC 16	376- 400	32.48
PC 17	401- 425	34.51
PC 18	426- 450	36.54
PC 19	451- 475	38.57
PC 20	476- 500	40.60
PC 21	501- 525	42.63
PC 22	526- 550	44.66
PC 23	551- 575	46.69
PC 24	576- 600	48.72
PC 25	601- 625	50.75
PC 26	626- 650	52.78
PC 27	651- 675	54.81
PC 28	676- 700	56.84
PC 29	701- 725	58.87
PC 30	726- 750	60.90
PC 31	751- 775	62.93
PC 32	776- 800	64.96
PC 33	801- 825	66.99
PC 34	826- 850	69.02
PC 35	851- 875	71.05
PC 36	876- 900	73.08
PC 37	901- 925	75.11
PC 38	926- 950	77.14
PC 39	951- 975	79.17
PC 40	976-1,000	81.20

ADD 2.03 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL 25 PAGES,
OR FRACTION THEREOF

MICROFICHE

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	NO. OF FICHE	PRICE
MF 01	1- 480	1-5	\$.86
MF 02	481- 576	6	1.03
MF 03	577- 672	7	1.20
MF 04	673- 768	8	1.37
MF 05	769- 864	9	1.54
MF 06	865- 960	10	1.71
MF 07	961-1,056	11	1.88
MF 08	1,057-1,152	12	2.05
MF 09	1,153-1,248	13	2.22
MF 10	1,249-1,344	14	2.39
MF 11	1,345-1,440	15	2.56
MF 12	1,441-1,536	16	2.73
MF 13	1,537-1,632	17	2.90
MF 14	1,633-1,728	18	3.07
MF 15	1,729-1,824	19	3.24

ADD \$0.17 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL MICROFICHE
(1-96 PAGES)

HOW TO ORDER ERIC DOCUMENTS
EDRS **ERIC**[®] **DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE**
 7420 FULLERTON ROAD, SUITE 110
 SPRINGFIELD, VA 22153-2852
 OPERATED BY
 CINCINNATI BELL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CBIS) FEDERAL
 800-443-3742 703-440-1400

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS ORDER FORM

- Order by 6 digit ED number
- Enter unit price
- Specify either Microfiche (MF) or Paper Copy (PC)
- Include shipping charges

ED NUMBER	NO. OF PAGES	NO. OF COPIES		UNIT PRICE	TOTAL UNIT COST
		MF	PC		
TOTAL NO. OF PAGES				SUBTOTAL	

UNIT PRICE SCHEDULE			RESIDENTS OF VA, MD AND DC - ADD APPLICABLE SALES TAX	
MICROFICHE (MF)			PAPER COPY (PC)	
NUMBER PAGES EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price	NUMBER PAGES EACH ED #	PRICE CODE
1 to 5 (up to 480 pages)	MF01	\$1.15	1 to 25	PC01
Each additional microfiche (additional 96 pages)		\$.25	Each additional 25 pages	
			SHIPPING CHARGES	
			TOTAL COST	

CHARTS FOR DETERMINING SHIPPING CHARGES

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE		1st CLASS POSTAGE FOR			MICROFICHE ONLY	
1-7	8-19	20-30	31-42	43-54	55-67	68-80
Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY	Microfiche ONLY
\$0.29	\$0.52	\$0.75	\$0.98	\$1.21	\$1.44	\$1.67

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE CHARGES FOR CONTINENTAL U.S. SHIPMENTS ONLY*

*UPS will not deliver to a P.O. Box Number. A Street Address must be provided.

1 lb. 81-160 MF or 1-75 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$2.79	2 lbs. 161-330 MF or 76-150 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$3.30	3 lbs. 331-500 MF or 151-225 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$3.74	4 lbs. 501-670 MF or 226-300 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.09	5 lbs. 671-840 MF or 301-375 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.31	6 lbs. 841-1010 MF or 376-450 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.53	7 lbs. 1011-1180 MF or 451-525 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$4.77	8 to 10 lbs. 1181-1690 MF 526-750 PC PAGES Not to Exceed \$5.17-\$5.94
--	--	---	---	---	--	---	---

NOTE—Orders for 81 or more microfiche and all orders for paper copies (PC) will be shipped via United Parcel Service unless otherwise instructed.

SEE REVERSE FOR EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICE

PAYMENTS: You may pay by

1. Enclosing CHECK or MONEY ORDER with your order. Foreign customer checks must be drawn on a U.S. bank.
2. Charge to a MasterCard or VISA account. Enter account number, card expiration date and signature. (EDRS also accepts telephone orders when charged to a MasterCard or VISA account.)
3. PURCHASE ORDERS: U.S. customers may enclose an authorized original purchase order. No purchase orders are accepted from foreign customers.
4. Charge to a DEPOSIT ACCOUNT. Enter deposit account number and sign order form.

PLEASE INDICATE METHOD OF PAYMENT AND ENTER REQUIRED INFORMATION.



WE HONOR
BOTH



- ☐ Check or Money Order ☐ Purchase Order (ATTACH ORIGINAL PURCHASE ORDER)
- ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA
- Account Number _____ Expiration Date _____
- Signature _____
- ☐ Deposit Account Number _____
- Signature _____

ENTER "SHIP TO" ADDRESS _____

CALL TOLL FREE 1-800-443-ERIC (3742) 24 HOURS A DAY - 7 DAYS A WEEK
 ALLOW 5 WORKING DAYS FOR EDRS TO PROCESS AND SHIP YOUR ORDER

EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY

Expedited delivery of ERIC documents is available.

- Call in your order 24 hours a day toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).
- Fax your order 24 hours a day 703-440-1408.

Your order will be shipped to you, by the method you select, on the fifth (5th) working day after receipt.

To insure expedited receipt, request shipment by either:

- USPS Express Mail
- Federal Express
- UPS Next Day Air
- FAX transmission of your document

Shipping and FAX transmission charges will be added to the cost of the document(s) by EDRS.

These requesting and delivery methods are in addition to the 3-day delivery services available in response to orders received through the use of on-line data base services.

STANDING ORDERS SUBSCRIPTION ACCOUNTS

Subscription orders for documents in the monthly issue of *Resources in Education* (RIE) are available on microfiche from EDRS. The microfiche are furnished on a diazo film base and without envelopes at \$0.111 per microfiche. If you prefer a silver halide film base, the cost is \$0.225 per microfiche and each microfiche is inserted into a protective envelope. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. A Standing Order Account may be opened by depositing \$1,500.00 or submitting an executed purchase order. The cost of each issue and shipping will be charged against the account. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

BACK COLLECTIONS

Back collections of documents in all issues of *Resources in Education* (RIE) since 1966 are available on microfiche at a unit price of \$0.131 per microfiche. The collections from 1966 through 1985 are furnished on a vesicular film base and without envelopes. Since 1986, collections are furnished on a diazo film base without envelopes. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. For pricing information, write or call toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. PRICE LIST

The prices set forth herein may be changed without notice; however, any price change is subject to the approval of the Contracting Officer/USED/Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Contracts and Grants Management Division.

2. PAYMENT

The prices set forth herein do not include any sales, use, excise, or similar taxes that may apply to the sale of microfiche or paper copy to the Customer. The cost of such taxes, if any, shall be borne by the Customer.

Payment shall be made net thirty (30) days from date of invoice. Payment shall be without expense to CBIS Federal.

3. REPRODUCTION

Express permission to reproduce a copyrighted document provided hereunder must be obtained from the copyright holder noted on the title page of such copyrighted document.

4. CONTINGENCIES

CBIS Federal shall not be liable to Customer or any other person for any failure or delay in the performance of any obligation if such failure or delay (a) is due to events beyond the control of CBIS Federal including, but not limited to, fire, storm, flood, earthquake, explosion, accident, acts of the public enemy, strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, labor shortages, work stoppages, transportation embargoes or delays, failure or shortage of materials, supplies or machinery, acts of God, or acts or regulations or priorities of the federal, state, or local governments; (b) is due to failures of performances of subcontractors beyond CBIS Federal's control and without negligence on the part of CBIS Federal; or (c) is due to erroneous or incomplete information furnished by Customer.

5. LIABILITY

CBIS Federal's liability, if any, arising hereunder shall not exceed restitution of charges.

In no event shall CBIS Federal be liable for special, consequential, or liquidated damages arising from the provision of services hereunder.

6. WARRANTY

CBIS FEDERAL MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

7. QUALITY

CBIS Federal will replace products returned because of reproduction defects or incompleteness. The quality of the input document is not the responsibility of CBIS Federal. Best available copy will be supplied.

8. CHANGES

No waiver, alteration, or modification of any of the provisions hereof shall be binding unless in writing and signed by an officer of CBIS Federal.

9. DEFAULT AND WAIVER

- If customer fails with respect to this or any other agreement with CBIS Federal to pay any invoice when due or to accept any shipment as ordered, CBIS Federal may, without prejudice to other remedies, defer any further shipments until the default is corrected, or may cancel the order.
- No course of conduct nor any delay of CBIS Federal in exercising any right hereunder shall waive any rights of CBIS Federal or modify this Agreement.

10. GOVERNING LAW

This Agreement shall be construed to be between merchants. Any questions concerning its validity, construction, or performance shall be governed by the laws of the State of Virginia.

11. DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS

Customers who have a continuing need for ERIC documents may open a Deposit Account by depositing a minimum of \$300.00. Once a Deposit Account is opened, ERIC documents will be sent upon request, and the account charged for the actual cost and postage. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

12. PAPER COPY (PC)

A paper copy (PC) is a xerographic reproduction, on paper, of the original document. Each paper copy has a Vellum Bristol cover to identify and protect the document.

13. FOREIGN POSTAGE

Postage for all countries other than the United States is based on the International Postage Rates in effect at the time the order is shipped. To determine postage, allow 160 microfiche or 75 (PC) pages per pound. Customers must specify the exact classification of mail desired, and include the postage for that classification with their order. Payment must be in United States funds.